

over Carnegie. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections in light of the following remarks.

Regarding claim 1, the Office Action argued that Carnegie discloses “the small footprint device connecting to a first network” (at 117 of Fig. 1) and “the small footprint device connecting to a second network” (at 120 of Fig. 1). Applicant respectfully disagrees. RF/WAN Gateway 117 is not a network, but rather a device that enables the portable computer 101 to connect to the network 120. Carnegie does not disclose two distinct networks as recited in Applicant’s claim 1.

Because Carnegie does not teach or suggest two networks, Applicant respectfully submits that Carnegie does not teach or suggest additional limitations of claim 1, including two distinct services communicating with the small footprint device: “the service accessible from the first network storing the information” and “a service accessible from the second network receiving the information” (emphasis added).

Regarding claim 7, the Office Action argued that Carnegie discloses “wherein the small footprint device executes a service for displaying dynamically generated content” and “wherein said small footprint device displaying the content comprises the service for displaying dynamically generated content displaying the content” at col. 6, line 62 to col. 8, line 67. Applicant respectfully disagrees. At the cited location, Carnegie provides a description for Figure 1 and portions of Figure 2 and does not teach or suggest “dynamically generated content.” As noted in col. 9, lines 2-11:

In block 225, destination server 130 automatically downloads files, e-mail or other information to portable device 101 that may have previously been identified at destination server 130 for communication to the user. Likewise, portable device 101 automatically uploads files, e-mail or other information to destination server 130 that the user may previously have identified for transmission to destination server 130. Once information transfer is complete, data grade connection 122 and tunnelled IP 124 are terminated.

There is no reference within Carnegie that the information that is exported and imported to and from portable device 101 is dynamic. In fact, Applicant submits that the use of the term “previously” in the above reference implies the opposite of “dynamic” content.

Regarding claims 8 and 9, the Office Action argued that Carnegie discloses “the small footprint device rejecting the content” and “the small footprint device filtering the content” at col. 9, line 1 to col. 10, line 65 and col. 12, lines 3-56. Applicant respectfully disagrees. At cols. 9 and 10, Carnegie discusses a basic network architecture. At col. 12, Carnegie discusses methods for billing the user for network access. Applicant can find no reference to or suggestion of “rejecting” or “filtering” content at the cited locations in Carnegie.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Carnegie does not teach or suggest Applicant’s remaining claims because the remaining claims are similar to or provide additional limitations to the claims discussed above.


Based on the above remarks, Applicant asserts that Carnegie does not teach or suggest Applicant’s claimed invention as recited in claims 5-38. Therefore, claims 5-38 are patentable over Carnegie. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Section 102(b) and 103(a) rejections of claims 5-38.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits the application is now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Conley, Rose & Tayon, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505\5181-29600\BNK.

Respectfully submitted,



B. Noël Kivlin
Reg. No. 33,929
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Conley, Rose & Tayon, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 476-1400

Date: 10-31-02